DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

THE ADMINISTRATOR

November 10, 1976

Honorable Wes Uhlman
Mayor
City of Seattle
Seattle, Washington

Dear Wes:

It is a heavy task for me to inform you that, in the increasingly difficult task of winnowing down the Downtown People Mover proposals, we have had to eliminate Seattle from further consideration at this time. Of the 38 cities that were in competition, only 11 still remain after this last set of decisions.

I wanted to write you personally about this, rather than permitting the news to go out from staff in the normal fashion, because I have such a high regard for the way you have approached the DPM plan in Seattle. Your personal leadership and the strong urban development links which your proposal presented, counted very much in its favor.

In the last analysis, however, the ratings of the staff consistently put the Seattle proposal out of the running. I can only tell you that this selection process has been very careful and professional, and that it has not been easy.

I was struck on my visit by two conditions that somewhat disadvantaged Seattle in the competition. First, you now have the monorail and, as inadequate as that may be in some respects, you are competing against cities which have no comparable service at all. Second, we are about to begin a major analysis of downtown transit alternatives with Metro Transit and the supporting jurisdictions. There is a strong body of thinking that a People Mover for Seattle should evolve out of that broader planning effort, rather than through this particular UMTA demonstration program with its near-term time horizon.

It may well be that your proposal will be validated by such a planning activity, although its length and alignment would likely be changed. If that is the case, I would hope that UMTA could support you with a capital grant at that time.

I appreciated your personal briefing on the DPM plan and want you to know that only the strong competition of other cities, and not any lack of effort on Seattle's part, brought us to our decision.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Patricelli

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

THE ADMINISTRATOR

DEC 22 1976

Honorable Stephen Clark
Mayor
Metropolitan Dade County
242 Courthouse
Miami, Florida 33130

Dear Mayor Clark:

I am writing to inform you of the results of our evaluation of materials submitted by Dade County in response to my March 4, 1976 letter regarding your proposed rapid transit line, and of our decision on the County's proposal for a Downtown People Mover (DPM). As is consistently the case, the technical work carried out by your staff has been of high quality and has facilitated our analysis of these significant, interrelated transportation improvements for the County.

It is our judgement that the County has adequately justified implementation of a heavy rail grade-separated rapid transit line, with an initial segment running between Dadeland and 65th Street, N.W. Further, the County has made a strong case for significantly improved downtown distribution as a means of encouraging greater rapid transit useage and alleviating current and projected downtown circulation problems. However I regret to inform you that your DPM proposal was not successful, during the intense competition with the other applicants, in surviving this final round of the evaluation process. I would like to elaborate on each of these decisions.

With respect to the rapid transit line, subject to successful completion of engineering for the Dadeline to 65th Street, N.W. segment and to the satisfaction of all statutory requirements, UMTA is prepared to commit between $500 and $600 million for project implementation. Accordingly, we believe that an initial operable rapid transit segment, including necessary parking facilities, feeder buses, and other support equipment and facilities, should be defined within the $500 to $600 million Federal funding level, plus any available Federal-aid highway funding and non-Federal matching funds.

This level of proposed Federal funding is somewhat lower than that projected in your responses to my March 4 letter. I believe that several possible cost saving approaches may be possible and should be examined in detail in the engineering phase. The ridership forecast for either alternatives A-7 or A-8 north of 65th Street N.W. were substantially lower than the rest of system and, based on our analysis, do not warrant inclusion in the rail system at this time. We believe that storage and maintenance of rolling stock at a single yard location are not critical to system operations and safety. It may well be that storage and maintenance functions can be separated, as is the case with numerous other rapid transit systems, so that smaller parcels of available land along the proposed right-of-way can be used.

With regard to your Downtown People Mover proposal, we found your plan to be justified and highly supportive of your rapid transit and urban development programs. We regret that superior aspects of other competing proposals and our own funding limitations make it impossible for us to offer you additional funding to implement that project. However, given the importance of improved downtown circulation to your efforts, we would be prepared to permit you to use funds within our $500 to $600 million reservation to implement your proposed DPM if adequate cost savings or reprogramming from rapid transit construction can be achieved.

Regarding other issues of significance, I want to encourage you to move ahead with interim and long-term solutions to bringing buses and carpools directly into downtown, using the I-95 busway. We understand that certain transportation system management techniques can be used which would result in alleviating close-in bottlenecks affecting this important transit facility.

With respect to overall transit system operating costs, we continue to seek a firm indication from the County as to a specific source (or sources) of non-Federal operating funds. I am sure that you share this concern and will continue to seek agreement as to a source at the State and local levels. Naturally, we shall take progress in reaching a consensus on -- or preferally in actually identifying through legislation, local referunda or other appropriate means -- non-Federal operating funding as we move toward actual system construction grants.

As you proceed with engineering, UMTA's staff will be happy to assist whenever necessary. Upon completion of initial segment engineering, environmental reviews, and other statutory requirements, it is UMTA's intention to offer a multi-year, fixed-dollar grant contract to the County.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Patricelli

Robert E. Patricelli

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

Honorable Tom Bradley
Mayor
City of Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Byron Cook
Chairman
Southern California Rapid Transit District
425 South Main Street
Los Angeles, California

Dear Mayor Bradley and Mr. Cook:

I am writing you in response to the four-part program for improvement of public transportation which you have submitted to the Department of Transportation. This program includes: (1) a regional transportation systems management (TSM) plan (identified in your analysis as Alternative II); (2) high level bus-on-freeway service (identified as Alternative IX-A); (3) a Downtown People Mover for the Los Angeles central business district; and (4) a rail rapid transit system in the Wilshire/La Brea corridor (identified as Alternative E).

The development of a consensus around this region-wide public transportation improvement program under your far-sighted leadership represents important progress in co-operative decision-making by the public agencies in the Los Angeles area and the State, and I want to compliment all agencies involved. The Los Angeles metropolitan area is the second largest urbanized area in the nation, and the provision of adequate public transportation alternatives for people in the region is of vital interest to this Department. We welcome the opportunity to respond positively to your proposals.

Our detailed review of your proposals has produced the following conclusions. We find the first two elements of your proposal--transportation systems management improvements, and high level bus-on-freeway service--to be well

justified by the analysis. Accordingly, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are prepared to provide the $7.8 million requested for preliminary engineering and environmental impact analysis on these proposals. The State Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) should begin the appropriate steps to secure FHWA funding, and should deal directly with FHWA on that matter; UMTA funds should be sought directly from that agency.

With regard to the Downtown People Mover (DPM), UMTA has reviewed your proposal in the context of the nation-wide competition which it has been conducting and in which Los Angeles remains as one of 11 finalists. I am pleased to inform you that Los Angeles has been selected as one of four winning cities in that competition to receive UMTA funds for implementation of such a system, commencing with a $1.28 million grant of preliminary engineering funds. Subject to satisfaction of environmental clearances and other statutory conditions, it is our intention to provide up to $100 million from UMTA discretionary capital grant funds to assist in the construction of your proposed DPM system. This dollar ceiling is necessitated by the fact that our resources are limited and that your proposal was more than twice as expensive as any other we were considering. We suggest that you consider funding the parking and highway elements of your plan from Federal-aid highway sources, in order to permit you to lower your need for UMTA capital grant funds to an amount within the $100 million ceiling.

With respect to your rapid transit proposal (Alternative E), we conclude that further study of fixed guideway alternatives in the Wilshire/La Brea corridor--but only in that corridor--is merited. This study may include initial engineering and environmental analysis, but before full preliminary engineering will be authorized, several issues must be resolved. Specifically:

--relationships between the proposed rapid transit and DPM systems must be examined, and any overlaps in service eliminated;

--all-bus alternatives must continue to be evaluated for the corridor, as your request for engineering funds itself suggests, and the possibility of

high-level bus transit along the Hollywood freeway to the San Fernando Valley should be explored as an alternative to extending the rapid transit line into the Valley;

--detailed information must be provided on the relationship between the proposed rapid transit line and the region's land use objectives as identified in the Regional Development Guide or other plans; and

--the position of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors on Alternative E must be stated, since the Board is identified as providing a portion of the capital funding for the proposal.

To support these further studies and initial engineering and environmental work on Alternative E, UMTA will entertain an application for up to $2 million under Section 9 of our Act.

I want to emphasize the importance which we place upon your aggressively pursuing Transportation Systems Management solutions in the months ahead. We believe that much can be accomplished by giving buses, carpools and other high occupancy vehicles preferential treatment through newly constructed exclusive lanes, new ramps, ramp metering and other techniques short of taking existing lanes from auto traffic. Your intentions and future success in these efforts, which are proposed in Alternative II, will figure importantly in our further reviews of the appropriateness of rail transit in the region. As we evaluate your overall public transportation improvement program, you should know that the willingness of the State and of local governments to provide funds needed to support transit operating costs associated with that program will be an important factor in our capital funding decisions. It does not make sense for the Federal government or for public agencies concerned with public transportation in the Los Angeles area to commit hundreds of millions of public dollars for improved transit capital facilities if a consensus for meeting future transit operating costs cannot be achieved. Therefore, as you proceed with planning and preliminary engineering of your ambitious and far-sighted four-part program, I urge you to continue your leadership roles in examining funding sources and in reaching a consensus on meeting the region's long-term transit operating needs.

You, of course, appreciate that neither UMTA nor FHWA can be committed at this time to provide capital funds to implement your program. Under Federal law, such commitments can be made only after environmental clearances and other statutory conditions have been fulfilled. Nevertheless, we do commit today to provide over $11 million for engineering and other studies from a combination of UMTA and FHWA sources. We look forward to continuing work with you in developing a public transportation system which will effectively serve the citizens of the Los Angeles region.

Sincerely,

William T. Coleman, Jr.

cc: Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Los Angeles City Council
CALTRANS
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

THE ADMINISTRATOR

DEC 2 2 1976

Honorable Stephen Clark
Mayor
Metropolitan Dade County
242 Courthouse
Miami, Florida 33130

Dear Mayor Clark:

I am writing to inform you of the results of our evaluation of materials submitted by Dade County in response to my March 4, 1976 letter regarding your proposed rapid transit line, and of our decision on the County's proposal for a Downtown People Mover (DPM). As is consistently the case, the technical work carried out by your staff has been of high quality and has facilitated our analysis of these significant, interrelated transportation improvements for the County.

It is our judgement that the County has adequately justified implementation of a heavy rail grade-separated rapid transit line, with an initial segment running between Dadeland and 65th Street, N.W. Further, the County has made a strong case for significantly improved downtown distribution as a means of encouraging greater rapid transit useage and alleviating current and projected downtown circulation problems. However I regret to inform you that your DPM proposal was not successful, during the intense competition with the other applicants, in surviving this final round of the evaluation process. I would like to elaborate on each of these decisions.

With respect to the rapid transit line, subject to successful completion of engineering for the Dadeline to 65th Street, N.W. segment and to the satisfaction of all statutory requirements, UMTA is prepared to commit between $500 and $600 million for project implementation. Accordingly, we believe that an initial operable rapid transit segment, including necessary parking facilities, feeder buses, and other support equipment and facilities, should be defined within the $500 to $600 million Federal funding level, plus any available Federal-aid highway funding and non-Federal matching funds.

This level of proposed Federal funding is somewhat lower than that projected in your responses to my March 4 letter. I believe that several possible cost saving approaches may be possible and should be examined in detail in the engineering phase. The ridership forecast for either alternatives A-7 or A-8 north of 65th Street N.W. were substantially lower than the rest of system and, based on our analysis, do not warrant inclusion in the rail system at this time. We believe that storage and maintenance of rolling stock at a single yard location are not critical to system operations and safety. It may well be that storage and maintenance functions can be separated, as is the case with numerous other rapid transit systems, so that smaller parcels of available land along the proposed right-of-way can be used.

With regard to your Downtown People Mover proposal, we found your plan to be justified and highly supportive of your rapid transit and urban development programs. We regret that superior aspects of other competing proposals and our own funding limitations make it impossible for us to offer you additional funding to implement that project. However, given the importance of improved downtown circulation to your efforts, we would be prepared to permit you to use funds within our $500 to $600 million reservation to implement your proposed DPM if adequate cost savings or reprogramming from rapid transit construction can be achieved.

Regarding other issues of significance, I want to encourage you to move ahead with interim and long-term solutions to bringing buses and carpools directly into downtown, using the I-95 bus-way. We understand that certain transportation system management techniques can be used which would result in alleviating close-in bottlenecks affecting this important transit facility.

With respect to overall transit system operating costs, we continue to seek a firm indication from the County as to a specific source (or sources) of non-Federal operating funds. I am sure that you share this concern and will continue to seek agreement as to a source at the State and local levels. Naturally, we shall take progress in reaching a consensus on -- or preferally in actually identifying through legislation, local referunda or other appropriate means -- non-Federal operating funding as we move toward actual system construction grants.

As you proceed with engineering, UMTA's staff will be happy to assist whenever necessary. Upon completion of initial segment engineering, environmental reviews, and other statutory requirements, it is UMTA's intention to offer a multi-year, fixed-dollar grant contract to the County.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Patricelli

Robert E. Patricelli

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

THE ADMINISTRATOR

Dec. 22 1976

Honorable George Latimer
Mayor
City Hall
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Dear Mayor Latimer:

We have completed our evaluation of the eleven finalist Downtown People Mover (DPM) proposals. I am pleased to inform you that the City of St. Paul has been selected as one of four sites for a demonstration of the feasibility of a fully automated people mover system in your downtown.

We were especially impressed in the case of St. Paul with the prospect of major new development commitments which could be triggered by the people mover, by the prospect of important value capture revenues for the system, and by the technical and implementation capacity of the Metropolitan Transit Commission. Given the fact that new development stimulus was a major factor in our decision, we ask that you furnish evidence within 90 days that private investment commitments outlined in correspondence to us have in fact been made.

With respect to your specific proposal, we do question the desirability of extending the people mover past the Associated Hospitals complex into the Historic Hills District. The cost of that segment, combined with its relatively low ridership and the presence of alternative bus service, means that UMTA will wish to consider with you, during the course of engineering, whether that additional segment should be built. Finally, we want to insure that the people mover proposal is tied to an aggressive, comprehensive parking and transportation systems management program, in order to stimulate use of the people mover system. We ask that such a coordinated plan be developed during the preliminary engineering stage.

You are now requested to submit a two-phase capital grant application for engineering and construction funding in accordance with the guidelines contained in our DPM Program Plan. I must stress, however, that until all legal and environmental requirements have been met, we cannot provide funding beyond the preliminary engineering and environmental analysis stages. Nonetheless, this action does reflect an UMTA commitment in principle to move to construction financing subject to resolution of the above issues and subject to the availability of funds.

We are looking forward to working with you in carrying out this innovative and nationally important project. Should you have any questions concerning your next steps, please do not hesitate to call Mr. Steven A. Barsony, Director, Office of AGT Applications, at (202) 426-2896.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Patricelli

Copies to: Wendell R. Anderson
Governor
State of Minnesota

Doug Kelm
Metropolitan Transit Commission

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

THE ADMINISTRATOR

Honorable Ralph J. Perk
Mayor
City of Cleveland
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

DEC 9 [illegible]

Dear Mayor Perk:

We have completed our evaluation of the eleven finalist Downtown People Mover (DPM) proposals. I am pleased to inform you that the City of Cleveland has been selected as one of four sites for a demonstration of the feasibility of a fully automated people mover system in your downtown.

We were especially impressed in the case of Cleveland with the need for providing improved downtown circulation links for the region's rapid transit system as a means of increasing usage of that system, and by the likely benefits in terms of increased retail sales and project rentals which such improved circulation could produce. During the course of engineering, we will be interested in progress made by the City, in conjunction with other public and private interests, in making immediate improvements in existing downtown circulation through the use of transportation systems management techniques, and in moving ahead with proposed development and redevelopment proposals.

You are now requested to submit a two-phase capital grant application for engineering and construction funding in accordance with the guidelines contained in our DPM Program Plan. I must stress, however, that until all legal and environmental requirements have been met, we cannot provide funding beyond the preliminary engineering and environmental analysis stages. Nonetheless, this action does reflect an UMTA commitment in principle to move to construction financing subject to resolution of the above issues and subject to the availability of funds.

We are looking forward to working with you in carrying out this innovative and nationally important project. Should you have any questions concerning your next steps, please do not hesitate to call Mr. Steven A Barsony, Director, Office of AGT Applications, at (202) 426-2896.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Patricelli

Copy to: Dale R. Finley
President, Board of Trustees
Regional Transit Authority

DOT LIBRARY
00399271